Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/006,089   First Named Applicant: Gary Cole

Examiner: Yigdall, Michael J.   Art Unit: 2192   Status of Application: Non-final

Tentative Participants:
(1) Robert Kowert   (2) Examiner Yigdall

(3) _____   (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: October 27, 2010   Proposed Time: 2:30 PM Eastern   AM/**PM**

Type of Interview Requested:
(1) [✓] Telephonic   (2) [ ] Personal   (3) [ ] Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [ ] YES   [✓] NO
If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) 103(a) Rejection	Indepen. Claims	Hoover; Dutcher	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(2) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(3) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(4) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

[✓] Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:
See attached proposed amendment and remarks.

_____

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____ .
NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).
This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature	Examiner/SPE Signature
Robert C. Kowert	
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative	
39,255	
Registration Number, if applicable	

DRAFT

10/006,089

<u>Proposed amendments:</u>

1. (Currently amended) A system for managing information, comprising:

a ~~software program stored on a~~ <u>non-transitory</u> computer-readable medium <u>storing</u>
<u>a software program</u> operable to maintain an identity index, wherein said
identity index comprises:

<u>a plurality of index keys, wherein each index key indexes a virtual identity</u>
<u>of a respective one of a plurality of users;</u>

a <u>plurality of</u> virtual identies[[ty]]<u>, wherein each virtual identity is indexed</u>
<u>within the identity index by one the plurality of index keys,</u>
<u>wherein each virtual identity is a virtual identity</u> of a <u>respective</u>
<u>one of the plurality of</u> users ~~of multiple computer resources~~,
<u>wherein each virtual identity comprises identity information of the</u>
<u>respective user in regard to multiple different computer resources</u>
<u>used by the same respective user, and wherein one or more of the</u>
<u>virtual identities comprises</u> ~~further comprising~~:

a plurality of information object identifiers<u>, wherein</u> each
<u>information object identifier identifies</u> ~~corresponding to~~ a
respective information object <u>of the respective user stored</u>
<u>at a respective one of the multiple different computer</u>
<u>resource</u>; and ~~for each information object,~~

a <u>plurality of</u> resource name<u>s, wherein each resource name</u>
identifies[[ying]] <u>which</u> one of the multiple <u>different</u>

DRAFT

computer resources ~~at which said~~ contains a respective one of the information object<u>s of the respective user</u> ~~is located~~, wherein <u>each</u> said resource name is ~~associated with said respective~~ linked to a respective one of the plurality of information object identifiers<u>;</u> and

wherein said identity index further comprises a plurality of resource definition<u>s, wherein each resource definition is a definition of a</u> ~~corresponding to each~~ respective said ~~named~~ <u>one of the multiple</u> computer resource<u>s, wherein</u> [[the]] <u>each</u> resource definition ~~further~~ comprises connection information <u>for the respective computer resource; and</u>

wherein the software program is operable to access the identity index via one of the plurality of index keys to locate and retrieve, from within the identity index, information from a respective one of the plurality of virtual identities indexed by the one of the index keys.

Remarks

Hoover teaches databases that store information about people, such as hospital patients or physicians. Hoover's various remote, heterogeneous user databases contain data that is transformed into a homogeneous data model. Location information and status information relating to the homogenized data is stored in a centralized object broker computer for object management, thereby facilitating location and retrieval of data items from the remote, heterogeneous user databases. *See* abstract. At the centralized object broker computer, cited map table 120 stores locations of the remote heterogeneous user databases. *See* column 5, lines 65-67. Cited Figure 6 shows various types of tables found in the centralized object broker computer and in the remote databases. Cited Figure 7 illustrates map table 120 of centralized object broker computer 20.

DRAFT

Hoover's map table 120, illustrated in cited Figure 7, is not constructed around users, or even around particular patients or physicians. It is certainly not indexed based on a plurality of users, or of physicians or of patients, nor does it contain index keys that index any virtual identities of users, physicians, or patients and that are used to access map table 120 to locate and retrieve the virtual identity of a user, physician, or patient from within map table 120. Instead, Hoover's map table 120 is simply a linear table arranged as a plurality of rows, with each row containing an object identifier and a location. "There is a record (a row) comprising a plurality of items associated with each object identifier for which data is stored anywhere in the system, globally," that is, "for each instance of an object created by any of the remote databases, there will be at least one entry in the map table 120. Thus, the map table 120 is generally consulted, and is indexed, by object identifier and location." *See* column 24, lines 36-51. Thus, Hoover explicitly declares that map table 120 is indexed and consulted by object identifiers of objects of the remote databases, not by index keys of map table 120 that index the virtual identities of users, physicians, or patients and that are used to access map table 120 to locate and retrieve, from within map table 120, the virtual identity of a user, physician, or patient. The object identifiers shown in map table 120 are not index keys of map table 120 that index the virtual identities of users, physicians, or patients and that are used to access map table 120 to locate and retrieve the virtual identity of a user, physician, or patient from within map table 120. Instead, the object identifier appearing in each row of map table 120 identifies an object located at a remote database location. For example, object identifier 0011 is located at remote database RDB1.

Moreover, even if some of Hoover's objects were computer user accounts, as the Examiner proposes on page 4 of the Office Action, map table 120 still would not be *an identity index that includes, for each user of a plurality of users, a virtual identity of the user, where the user uses multiple computer resources, each one containing an information object of the user, and where the virtual identity of that user comprises, for each information object of that user: an information object identifier corresponding to the information object of the user; and a resource name identifying which one of the*

DRAFT

*multiple computer resources contains the information object of the user, where the resource name is associated with the information object identifier; **and an index key indexing the virtual identity of the user, where the index key is native to the identity index, and where the software program is configured to access the identity index via the index key to locate and retrieve, from within the identity index, the virtual identity of the user.*** Nor does Hoover, even if modified to include user account objects, teach *locating and communicating with each information object of each user by accessing such a virtual identity of the user.* Hoover's map table 120 is indexed and consulted by object identifiers of objects at remote databases, not index keys of map table 120 that index the virtual identities of users, physicians, or patients and that are used to access map table 120 to locate and retrieve, from within map table 120, the virtual identity of a user, physician, or patient.

The Examiner relies on Dutcher regarding computer user accounts. However, as shown above, even if Hoover were modified to include user account objects, the resulting apparatus would still fail to exhibit the complete combination of limitations currently recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Moreover, the Office Action fails to provide a valid reason for the proposed modification. The Examiner asserts Hoover can fill a need, described by Dutcher at column 1, lines 37-47, for managing different computer user accounts on multiple, heterogeneous computer resources based on a single user account definition. The Examiner overlooks the fact that the cited paragraph of Dutcher describes the state of the art prior to Dutcher's invention, and that Dutcher's own technique precisely fills the cited need. *See* Dutcher's Abstract and Summary. Since Dutcher already addresses the cited need in an intended way, the cited need does not provide a reason to combine Dutcher with Hoover. In fact, the purpose of Dutcher's teachings is to satisfy the cited need in the particular way described in Dutcher, not in some hindsight combination with Hoover.